UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

In Re:)	
)	
AREDIA and ZOMETA PRODUCTS)	No. 3:06-MDL-01760
LIABILITY LITIGATION)	Judge Campbell/Brown
(MDL No. 1760))	-
•)	
This Document Relates to:)	
Case No. 3:07-CV-00035 (William Supina))	

TO: The Honorable Todd J. Campbell

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Currently pending before the Court is Novartis' Motion to Show Cause Why Plaintiff
William Supina's case should not be dismissed. (DE 567). The Magistrate Judge previously
submitted a Report and Recommendation that this case be dismissed as Plaintiff did not timely
file a Plaintiff's Fact Sheet (PFS). (DE 654). This Report and Recommendation was rejected by
the District Judge as Plaintiff objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation,
stating that Mr. Supina had recently passed away and Plaintiff's counsel was attempting to locate,
by way of a private investigator, the appropriate person to substitute. (DE 671, DE 684). The
District Judge again referred to the Magistrate Judge for reconsideration and further proceedings.
(DE 684).

Despite his assertions in October 2007, Plaintiff's counsel has not informed the Court that he has found a substitute representative. At this point, Plaintiff's counsel has had well over six months to attempt to locate a personal representative/next of kin.

For the reasons stated in the previous report and recommendation on this matter (DE

be **GRANTED** and that Plaintiff William Supina's case be dismissed without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to respond to the PFS. Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any party has ten (10) days from receipt of this Report and Recommendation in which to file any written objection to it with the District Court. Any part opposing said objections shall have ten (10) days from receipt of any objections filed in which to file any responses to said objections. Failure to file specific objections within ten (10) days of receipt of this Report and Recommendation can constitute a waiver of further appeal of this Recommendation. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Cowherd v. Million*, 380 F.3d 909, 912 (6th Cir. 2004 (en banc)).

JOE B. BROWN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE